

# Richmond Dispatch.

SATURDAY.....MARCH 11, 1882.

## Aye or No?

**Speaker FOWLER, General ELLIOTT, Judge LYBROOK, and some others of the Readjuster members of the Legislature are so companionable and sociable that we can never find it in our heart to write anything that is harsh concerning them. The best way to do is not to become acquainted with such fellows. Their presence reminds us always of MAGINN's advice to his brother Tories—namely, that if they should travel all day in a stage-coach with an agreeable, cultured, and entertaining gentleman who at parting should inform them that he was a Whig, they mustn't believe him, but always think of him as a Tory.**

Nevertheless, we are not going to let Speaker FOWLER go scot-free in regard to the wonderful ruling he made last week on a point of order raised by ex-Speaker HANGER. Let us explain the matter. A rule of the House of Delegates reads as follows:

"Upon a division of the House on any question, a member who is present and fails to vote shall, on the demand of any other member, be counted on the negative of the question."

Now, to an ordinary mind it would seem plain that this rule could never be made to apply to an election. "A division of the House on any question" are words which clearly imply a division of the House into two groups only—a negative group and an affirmative group; and such was Mr. HANGER's point. But the new Speaker promptly overruled the point, and ruled in effect that when SMITH and JONES are candidates for a judgeship in the Readjuster House of Delegates the Readjuster Speaker will rule, and the Readjuster House will sustain the decision, that SMITH, if a Readjuster, is the affirmative side of the question, and JONES, if a Funder, is the negative side of the question. This puts DANIEL O'CONNELL's nomenclature to shame. DAN, put down a common cold on one occasion by telling me that she was a "hypothemus," an "isosceles triangle," a "parallelogram," and various other similar things; but FOWLER put down HANGER by calling his (FOWLER's) candidate for judge the affirmative side of question, thus proving that HANGER's candidate, if he had one, was the "negative side of the question," and therefore that all the members of the House, Readjusters or Funders, who had refused to vote for Fowler's candidate had by that refusal voted for HANGER's candidate—a conclusion which must greatly have puzzled the understandings of some of the distinguished gentlemen who had so recently reversed a decision of the Supreme Court of Appeals.

We suggest to Mr. FOWLER that his reasoning must have a flaw in it; for if BROWN were running as well as JONES and SMITH his ruling would "fail to make the connection." Think of it, Mr. Speaker. What will you do when you go to elect a judge of the Hustings Court of Richmond if the Funders should happen to have two candidates?—If Mr. HANGER should vote for CHRISTIAN, Mr. COGHILL for WARD, and Mr. FOWLER for ATKINS? Pray, how would you decide in that case? To whom would you accord the honor of being "the negative side of the question"?—and to whom the honor of being "the affirmative side of the question"? Is WARD or CHRISTIAN any more of a "negative side of the question" than ATKINS? And if not, where will your ruling be when the next election comes off? And if your ruling is that demonstrated to be wrong when three candidates are voted for, does it not necessarily follow that it was wrong when only two candidates were voted for? As surely as the sum of two and two is four so surely was your ruling wrong. It is excusable only because it was hastily made. Subsequent reflection must have convinced you that it is wholly unjustifiable and therefore untenable.

Mr. RIDDLEBEEFER on the same day Speaker FOWLER made his remarkable ruling saw that it wouldn't do, and plainly warned the Senate that an alleged election might be held by the courts to be no election if it was consummated only by Speaker FOWLER's assumption of the right to cast the votes of MESSRS. POLLARD, STUBBS, DAVIS, SKINNER, LYONS, and others in "the negative"—a negative created by Mr. FOWLER himself—a "flat" negative, so to speak. And thus the case stands. We trust, however, that should any further unlawful attempts be made to elect a judge for this city the Speaker will not cast any other vote than his own, nor trouble the public with any more flat negative sides of questions.

The rule under which Mr. FOWLER made his extraordinary ruling may be a very good one when confined to the purpose for which it was intended to be used by its framers, not one of whom, we suppose, ever conceived the idea that it could or would ever be used by the Speaker of the House for the purpose of securing the election of the Speaker's candidate for any office, against the protest of the gentlemen who were thus against their will made to elect that Speaker's candidate. Oh, no. That ruling must never be repeated, FOWLER. We are sure it was conscientiously made, but equally as sure that it won't work when there are three candidates.

Well, what of all? "Only this and nothing more!" Let as the Readjusters have only 22 votes in the Senate when LYBROOK and WINGFIELD refuse to act with them, as they will never any of these unlawful elections of judges come up, and as it will be necessary for them to have 21 out of these 22 present whenever the opposers of such elections decline to vote, it is almost absolutely certain that said opposers will have it in their power to prevent all such elections, as well as to kill off all objectionable and revolutionary measures. There is no more money to be made by staying here. The spring is upon us. Two weeks will bring the 1st of April. After that date there will never again be even twenty Readjusters in the Senate. Persevere, then, ye true and faithful servants of the people, and your efforts will be crowned with success.

Instruct your legislators that they must not try to cheat the Democratic party of the country, nor throw the next Congress into the hands of the Republicans. If neither of these things is to be done, the man's redistricting bill will fail.

If we believe all men to be free and equal—and if to assert this equality, so far as the African is concerned, we wage war and amend our Constitution—how can we deny it to the Asiatic?—*New York Herald*.

We don't believe it. No white man believes it except theoretically.

To the rest, Mr. LINCOLN and all his Cabinet and all other Republicans protested over and over again that the war was not begun to assert "African equality."

## That Ruling.

Suppose there were a Funder majority in the Senate and a Readjuster majority in the House of Delegates. In that case, according to Speaker FOWLER's decision, the Readjuster votes in the Senate would in an election be on the negative side of the question, whereas in the House of Delegates the Funder votes would be on the negative side of the question. But elections are made on joint ballot; and so a Readjuster vote in the Senate would in the general count be converted into an affirmative vote if the Readjusters had the majority in the two houses, whereas if the Funders had the majority in the two houses the Funder vote in the House of Delegates would be transformed into an affirmative vote. How is that, FOWLER? Wouldn't that be a "transformation scene" worthy of ex-Speaker RANDALL's attention?

Congress ought at once to pass a law prohibiting any State Legislature from so districting a State for the election of members of the national House of Representatives as to put ten thousand more people in one district than in another. Such gerrymandering ought not to be allowed.

We are pleased to see that the Charleston *News* and *Courier* takes Secretary FRELINGHUYSEN to task for the execrable English and still more execrable taste of his cablegram to England touching the late attempt to assassinate the Queen. Read it again:

"Remembering the sympathy of her Majesty and the British people in our recent national bereavement, the feeling of indignation and thankfulness for the Queen's safety is deep and universal."

Says the *News* and *Courier*:

"The inevitable conclusion is that the American people would not have been thankful for the Queen's escape if President Garfield had not been shot at, because in that case there would have been no 'national bereavement to call for sympathy.'

DANVILLE.

## Forty-Seven New Dentists.

The forty-second annual commencement of the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery took place Thursday afternoon at Ford's Opera-House, in Baltimore. There is a very large audience. The graduates and students of the college were seated on the stage. The programme consisted of music by the orchestra of Ford's Opera-House, prayer by Rev. Joseph L. Stitt; announcement of graduates by Professor F. J. S. Gorgas, dean; conferring of degrees; presentation of prizes, as follows: First collegiate prize, a gold medal, for the most number of votes for examination; John S. Bizzell, of North Carolina; second collegiate prize, a dental engine, for the best work in the whole month and filling teeth; J. J. Sanjurio, of West Indies; third prize, set of Harris' tools for best set in plastic work; J. J. Sanjurio; fourth prize, set varnished tools, for mechanical dentistry; C. L. Alexander, of North Carolina; second fourth prize, best plate-work, Samuel P. Sharp, of Tennessee; Professor Richard F. Gandy, M. D., delivered the annual oration; John S. Bizzell, of North Carolina, delivered the class valedictory. The annual meeting of the alumni of the college was held in the forenoon at the college. Dr. F. J. S. Gorgas called the meeting to order. The election for officers resulted as follows: President, James B. Hodgkin, D. D. S.; Vice-Presidents, L. J. Gorgas and Charles Harris; Recording Secretary, Charles Steel; Corresponding Secretary, J. E. Shriever; Treasurer, E. B. Bliss.

The graduates for 1882 number forty-seven, and their names and residences are as follows: Henry Arapahoe Abendchein, Maryland; Charles Lee Alexander, North Carolina; Pedro A. Areantes, South America; Julius Alonzo Ballantine, North Carolina; John S. Bizzell, North Carolina; Gordon H. Claude, Maryland; W. Connor Cleckley, South Carolina; Genaro W. Cooke, South America; Charles Willy Daly, of West Indies; Amos Daniels, Pennsylvania; William Daniel, of Virginia; Harper Du Ford, District of Columbia; Charles E. Dinger, Maryland; Louis Pieque Duotter, South Carolina; Thomas S. Eader, Maryland; Wallace W. Freeman, Maryland; Ferdinand Samuel Gorgas, Pennsylvania; G. Ashland Hamill, West Virginia; Irby Hardy, Virginia; Lewis James Harrington, Virginia; William Heyburn, Jr., New York; George W. Hessey, New York; Philip Fletcher Langenau, North Carolina; Archie McAlpine, Pennsylvania; James P. McDonald, Mississippi; John Miller, New York; George Edward Morrow, Maryland; Steven Brown Worcester, District of Columbia; Gustavus North, Iowa; George A. Patrick, Georgia; Hugh Pirkey, Virginia; W. Charles Rafton, New York; Norman J. Roberts, Illinois; Samuel P. Sharp, Tennessee; James E. Shriever, North Carolina; Charles Alfred Slocum, New York; Henderson Snell, North Carolina; Mordene Gist Sykes, Maryland; George G. Taylor, Virginia; Ellen C. Tucker, Virginia; T. John Welch, Virginia; B. H. Whittington, Maryland; Robert Campbell Williamson, M. D., South Carolina; John M. Wilson, Pennsylvania; Cincero Reneta Yearick, Ohio.—*Baltimore American*.

The author of *Calais-Moral*, noticed in this column a few days ago, and advertised by J. W. RANDOLPH & ENGLISH, has sent us a bound copy of that book with the word "Dispatch" upon it in gold letters. We return thanks for this unusual favor.

We have read a good deal of the book, and have found it interesting. It tells a great deal of the author's history, and everywhere "points a moral" if occasion offers.

*A Commentary on the Gospel According to Mark.* By the Rev. W. A. CAMPBELL.

A volume of 346 pages, in cloth, \$1 net; same in four parts, each, 25 cents net. We have received a copy of this book, the work of our neighbor across the river, whose pen is ever busy, and who has received from Professor HENRY C. ALEXANDER, D. D., of Union Theological Seminary, the following opinion:

"I congratulate you, my dear brother, on your great success in this most laudable undertaking. You, in my judgment, have approached creditably near the point of ideal excellence, and from your aims were somewhat confined by the very nature of the task you had undertaken of itself. Making the necessary allowance for this limitation, if there is any drawback on the admirable merit of your performance, it has so far escaped my attention. I can heartily endorse all that has been said in its favor by others (referring to testimony in a circular), and would add that it is, in my opinion, the best Sunday-school commentary I know of anywhere."

That is high praise indeed, and it comes from a high source.

For sale by the Presbyterian Board of Publication.

## Tobacco Questions.

DANVILLE, Va., March 8, 1882.

To the Editor of the *Dispatch*:

Your paper of the 3d instant contained a letter signed "H.," on the repeal of the tobacco tax, which called my notice from me, as the writer takes issue with views expressed by me in a former letter. "H." lost sight of the fact that I had written heartily in favor of abolishing the tobacco tax as he is, and I have to say the representative from this district in Congress is doing more in the interest of reduction or abolition of this tax than any other member from Virginia. The tax is certainly an unjust one, and doubtless affects the price of all leaf tobacco which enters into domestic consumption, and incidentally such leaf as is shipped abroad, which is yet suitable for domestic use. Furthermore, as long as the tax continues, interested parties can begin an agitation for the very purpose of depressing the leaf market. So let it be abolished by all means, but don't delude the growers of shipping tobacco by making them expect relief from a measure which will give them none. No tobacco is taxed except such as is consumed in the United States, and how the tax affects the price of that class of tobacco utterly unsuited to the domestic taste I cannot see."

"H.'s" argument amounts to this: "The culture of shipping tobacco paid before the war, when there was no tax, and does not pay now when there is a tax. Therefore, the tax is the cause of the unprofitability." If the tax does not render unprofitable the culture of such tobacco as is used at home (all of which it reaches), why should it have this effect on that raised for export, which it does not reach?" But," says "H.," "some of the dark leaf tobacco of the Southside do enter into domestic use." It is true that some of the common grades are used by the manufacturers of Lynchburg and Liberty in making the lowest and cheapest grade of plug tobacco; but they only use it because it is cheap. If they could find anything cheaper, they would use it instead. With this exception, the product of the whole dark tobacco region south of James river goes abroad either as leaf or manufactured, and pays no tax.

In Petersburg we have the largest tobacco factories in the State. Some of them work almost exclusively for export, and use dark Virginia leaf; others work mostly for the domestic trade and use western tobacco.

"Why this difference?" "H." seems to take dark Virginia tobacco, strong in itself, and strengthened further by hard firing, as a standard of excellence, of which all other tobaccos are but imitations or substitutes. Where is the profit of using White Burley at \$20 per hundred-weight, instead of Virginia leaf at \$7? It is true that the Burley absorbs a large amount of sweetening, and its weight is thereby greatly increased; but the sweetening costs more than Virginia leaf, and in the manufacture the article is taxed as much as the tobacco.

The estate of Margaret is estimated at \$10,000,000, so that there is some \$700,000 to be divided among the societies last mentioned. Miss Mary Burr died in the summer of 1865 and left all her property to Sarah for her life, ordering that legacies to the amount of \$25,000 be paid at the death of Sarah. Among them are these: American Bible Society, \$25,000; American Church Missionary Society, \$25,000; Domestic Missionary Society of Episcopal Church, \$20,000; Foreign Missionary Society of Episcopal Church (for Africa and China), \$20,000; American Tract Society, \$10,000. The residue of her estate she devised to the American Bible Society, the New York Hospital, St. Luke's Hospital, and the Foreign and Domestic Boards of Missions of the Episcopal Church, to be divided in proportion to the amounts of the thousands of other Federal soldiers who were laid to rest there during the days when nearly every church and all the large buildings in the city were hospitals, filled with sick and wounded.—*Alexandria Gazette*.

It is believed that in addition to the Central Lunatic Asylum we will soon have the Colored Normal School and William and Mary College located in or near Petersburg.

ROBIN ADAMS.

## PETERSBURG.

DEATH OF A CHURCH MEMBER.—NARROW ESCAPE OF A FAMILY FROM A TERRIBLE DEATH: CHILOFORM ADMINISTERED AND THEIR HOUSE SET ON FIRE—REQUEST FOR THE MICHIGAN OFFENDER—THE PETERSBURG POSTMASTERSHIP—STEEL RAILS FOR THE PETERSBURG ROAD—SWEET COUNTRY IMPROVEMENTS—THE FIRST SHIPMENT—DISCHARGE OF A SOMEWHAT NOTED PHOSPHOR.

(Correspondence of the Richmond Dispatch.)

MARCH 10, 1882.

Rev. James W. Harrison, a local preacher of the Methodist Church, died at his residence, in the western part of the city, at an early hour this morning, after a few days' illness of typhoid-pneumonia. He was a man of most estimable character, a zealous Christian, and was known and respected by all classes of the community.

The storehouse and entire stock of merchandise belonging to Mr. George R. Mattox, together with his dwelling-house, attached to the store, situated on the Jerusalem plank-road, in Sussex county, about fifteen miles from this city, was entirely consumed by fire last Tuesday night at 11 o'clock. Mr. Mattox, wife, and children, who were sleeping in an adjoining room to the store, were awakened by the fire, and barely had time to escape with safety. It is believed that they had been stupefied by the administration of chloroform. The store door was found opened, through which burglars effected an entrance. After administering chloroform, as is believed, they robbed the store and set it on fire. There is no positive clue as yet to the perpetrators of the deed. Mr. Mattox's loss is estimated at \$1,000, with no insurance.

Recent experiments have also shown that the Burley can be successfully raised. It is folly for producers to try and dictate to consumers as to what they shall use. The true policy is to find out what the consumer wants and act accordingly.

When "H." talks about the "taxed dark-tobacco man," he is merely beating the air. The dark-tobacco man is destroyed by persisting in raising what is unprofitable. The demand for his product is small at present, with every reason to believe that it will be still smaller in future.

The requisition from the Governor of Michigan for the delivery of P. H. McCracken, of Chesterfield county, who is charged with the embezzlement of \$1,000 of the public funds of Mississippian county, in that state, reached here yesterday afternoon, addressed to Lafayette Charter, the sheriff of that county, who came on here for the accused. It should properly have been sent directly to the Governor, but it will be taken over by the sheriff this afternoon and delivered at once to Governor Cameron for his approval. McCracken, as previously announced, is out on bail in the sum of \$1,000, under an order of the judge of the Hustings Court.

A good deal of interest is being manifested in the matter of the appointment of pastor of the Petersburgh Methodist Church—Services—Service of the pastor, Rev. John HANNON. Subjects: 11 A. M. and 7:30 P. M. "A New System of Tactics."

MARCH 11, 1882.

REV. J. Z. TYLER on the International Lesson, Teachers and adult scholars of all denominations.

TO-MORROW from 3 to 4 o'clock, the usual service of Song, conducted by the General Secretary.

MONDAY EVENING at 8:30, Young Men's Gospel Service—Mr. ARTHUR, leader. Every young man welcome.

THURSDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study. All young men invited.

FRIDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

SATURDAY MORNING at 10:30, Conversational Bible Study.

SUNDAY MORNING at 10:30, Conversational Bible Study.

MONDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

TUESDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

WEDNESDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

THURSDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

FRIDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

SATURDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

SUNDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

MONDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

TUESDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

WEDNESDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

THURSDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

FRIDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

SATURDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

SUNDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

MONDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

TUESDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

WEDNESDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

THURSDAY NIGHT at 8:30, Conversational Bible Study.

FRIDAY NIGHT at 8: